arXiv:hep-ph/9404352v1 28 Apr 1994

UMN-TH-1249-94
hep-ph/yymmddd
April 1994

Big Bang Baryogenesis[1]

Keith A. Olive
School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

1 The Standard Model

One of the most basic questions we can ask about the Universe is: What is the origin of matter? There are of course many ways in which to interpret this question, and there are varying depths to which it can be answered. Essentially all of the mass in the Universe that is *observed* is in the form of baryons, today consisting of protons and neutrons in the nuclei of atoms. While baryons may not be the dominant component of the Universe, they are without a doubt present and essential to our existence. However, the fact that a significant part of the mass of the Universe is baryonic is not in and of itself surprising. The lightest baryons are relatively long lived by particle physics standards and massive. Protons have extremely long lifetimes (or, in a boring world may be stable) and neutrons live long enough to become incorporated primarily into helium nuclei in the early Universe (see below). While electrons are stable (so long as electric charge is conserved), and they are present in numbers equal to that of protons, they are too light to make a significant contribution to the mass density of the Universe. Other stable particles which may yet be found to be massive, such as neutrinos, or still to be discovered such as the lightest supersymmetric particle, may in fact dominate the overall mass density of the Universe. There are however, two known particles which on the basis of mass and lifetime could be expected to contribute to the mass of the Universe: the anti-proton and the anti-neutron. $\bar{p}$ and $\bar{n}$ have, of course, exactly the same mass and lifetime as p and n. Yet these antibaryons are not observed in any abundance in nature. The creation of this asymmetry between baryons and anti-baryons or between matter and anti-matter is the subject of these lectures.

To deal with the specific problem of the baryon asymmetry, it will be useful to briefly review the standard cosmological model as a framework towards a solution. To put the problem in perspective, it useful to have an idea of the general sequence of events which are believed to have occurred since the big bang. The earliest times (after the big bang) that we are able to discuss are after $t \simeq 10^{-44}$s, or at temperatures of about 10^{18} GeV. This period is the Planck epoch and a description of events at or prior to this time would require a more complete theory of quantum gravity which may yet be found in string theory. The Grand Unified (GUT) scale is typically at $T \sim 10^{15}$ GeV at times of about 10^{-35}s. Standard models of baryogenesis and inflation may have played important roles at this time. Barring new interactions at an intermediate scale, electroweak symmetry breaking then occurred at times of order 10^{-10}s at the electroweak scale of 100 GeV. Quark-gluon confinement should have taken place at $t \sim 10^{-5}$s at $T \sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD} \sim 100$ MeV. Big bang nucleosynthesis and the formation of the light element isotopes of D, ^{3}He, ^{4}He and ^{7}Li took place between 1 and 100 s, at temperatures below 1 MeV. It wasn't until $t \sim 10^{12}$ s or $T \sim 1$ eV that recombination of neutral hydrogen occurred and the formation of galaxies began. Finally to put things in perspective, the age of the Universe today is $\sim 10^{17}$ s and the temperature is the well known 2.726 K as measured by COBE [1]

---

[1] To be published in the proceedings of the 33rd International Winter School on Nuclear and Particle Physics, "Matter Under Extreme Conditions", Feb. 27 - March 5 1994, Schladming Austria, eds. H. Latal and W. Schweiger (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994).

The standard big bang model assumes homogeneity and isotropy, so that space-time can be described by the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker metric which in co-moving coordinates is given by

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + R^2(t)\left[\frac{dr^2}{(1-kr^2)} + r^2\left(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2\right)\right] \tag{1}$$

where $R(t)$ is the cosmological scale factor and k is the three-space curvature constant ($k = 0, +1, -1$ for a spatially flat, closed or open Universe). k and R are the only two quantities in the metric which distinguish it from flat Minkowski space. It is also common to assume the perfect fluid form for the energy-momentum tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = pg^{\mu\nu} + (p+\rho)u^\mu u^\nu \tag{2}$$

where $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the space-time metric described by (1), p is the isotropic pressure, ρ is the energy density and $u^\mu = (1,0,0,0)$ is the velocity vector for the isotropic fluid. Einstein's equation yield the Friedmann equation,

$$H^2 \equiv \left(\frac{\dot{R}}{R}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{3}8\pi G_N\rho - \frac{k}{R^2} + \frac{1}{3}\Lambda \tag{3}$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\ddot{R}}{R}\right) = \frac{1}{3}\Lambda - \frac{1}{6}8\pi G_N(\rho + 3p) \tag{4}$$

where Λ is the cosmological constant, or equivalently from $T^{\mu\nu}{}_{;\nu} = 0$

$$\dot{\rho} = -3H(\rho + p) \tag{5}$$

These equations form the basis of the standard big bang model.

At early times ($t < 10^5$ yrs) the Universe is thought to have been dominated by radiation so that the equation of state can be given by $p = \rho/3$. If we neglect the contributions to H from k and Λ (this is always a good approximation for small enough R) then we find that

$$R(t) \sim t^{1/2} \tag{6}$$

and $\rho \sim R^{-4}$ so that $t \sim (3/32\pi G_N\rho)^{1/2}$. Similarly for a matter or dust dominated Universe with $p = 0$,

$$R(t) \sim t^{2/3} \tag{7}$$

and $\rho \sim R^{-3}$. The Universe makes the transition between radiation and matter domination when $\rho_{rad} = \rho_{matter}$ or when $T \simeq$ few × 10^3 K.

Figure 1: The evolution of the cosmological density parameter, Ω, as a function of the scale factor for a closed, open and spatially flat Universe.

In the absence of a cosmological constant, one can define a critical energy density ρ_c such that $\rho = \rho_c$ for $k = 0$

$$\rho_c = 3H^2/8\pi G_N \tag{8}$$

In terms of the present value of the Hubble parameter this is,

$$\rho_c = 1.88 \times 10^{-29} {h_o}^2 \mathrm{gcm}^{-3} \tag{9}$$

where

$$h_o = H_o/(100\mathrm{kmMpc}^{-1}\mathrm{s}^{-1}) \tag{10}$$

The cosmological density parameter is then defined by

$$\Omega \equiv \frac{\rho}{\rho_c} \tag{11}$$

in terms of which the Friedmann equation, Eq. (3), can be rewritten as

$$(\Omega - 1)H^2 = \frac{k}{R^2} \tag{12}$$

so that $k = 0, +1, -1$ corresponds to $\Omega = 1, \Omega > 1$ and $\Omega < 1$. Observational limits on h_o and Ω are[2]

$$0.4 \leq h_o \leq 1.0 \qquad 0.1 \leq \Omega \leq 2 \tag{13}$$

It is important to note that Ω is a function of time or of the scale factor. The evolution of Ω is shown in figure 1 for $\Lambda = 0$.
For a spatially flat Universe, $\Omega = 1$ always. When $k = +1$, there is a maximum value for the scale factor R. At early times (small values of R), Ω always tends to one. Note that the fact that we do not yet know the sign of k, or equivalently whether Ω is larger than or smaller than unity, implies that we are at present still at the very left in the figure. What makes this peculiar is that one would normally expect that the sign of k to become apparent after a Planck time of 10^{-43} s. It is extremely puzzling that some 10^{60} Planck times later, we still do not know the sign of k.

1.1 The Hot Thermal Universe

The epoch of recombination occurs when electrons and protons form neutral hydrogen through $e^- + p \rightarrow \mathrm{H} + \gamma$ at a temperature $T_R \sim$ few $\times 10^3$ K $\sim$1 eV. For $T < T_R$, photons are decoupled while for $T > T_R$, photons are in thermal equilibrium and the Universe is usually taken to be radiation dominated so that the content of the radiation plays a very important role. Today, the content of the microwave background consists of photons with $T_o = 2.726 \pm .01$ K[1]. We can calculate the energy density of photons from

$$\rho_\gamma = \int E_\gamma dn_\gamma \tag{14}$$

where the density of states is given by

$$dn_\gamma = \frac{g_\gamma}{2\pi^2}[exp(E_\gamma/T) - 1]^{-1} q^2 dq \tag{15}$$

and $g_\gamma = 2$ simply counts the number of degrees of freedom for photons, $E_\gamma = q$ is just the photon energy (momentum). (I am using units such that $\hbar = c = k_B = 1$ and will do so through the remainder of these lectures.) Integrating (14) gives

$$\rho_\gamma = \frac{\pi^2}{15} T^4 \tag{16}$$

which is the familiar blackbody result.

In general, at very early times, at very high temperatures, other particle degrees of freedom join the radiation background when $T \sim m_i$ for each particle type i if that type is brought into thermal equilibrium through interactions. In equilibrium the energy density of a particle type i is given by

$$\rho_i = \int E_i dn_{q_i} \tag{17}$$

and

$$dn_{q_i} = \frac{g_i}{2\pi^2}[exp[(E_{q_i} - \mu_i)/T] \pm 1]^{-1} q^2 dq \tag{18}$$

where again g_i counts the total number of degrees of freedom for type i,

$$E_{q_i} = \left(m_i^2 + q_i^2\right)^{1/2} \tag{19}$$

μ_i is the chemical potential if present and ± corresponds to either Fermi or Bose statistics.

In the limit that $T \gg m_i$ the total energy density can be conveniently expressed by

$$\rho = \left(\sum_B g_B + \frac{7}{8}\sum_F g_F\right)\frac{\pi^2}{30}T^4 \equiv \frac{\pi^2}{30}N(T)T^4 \tag{20}$$

where $g_{B(F)}$ are the total number of boson (fermion) degrees of freedom and the sum runs over all boson (fermion) states with $m \ll T$. The factor of 7/8 is due to the difference between the Fermi and Bose integrals. Equation (20) defines N(T) by taking into account new particle degrees of freedom as the temperature is raised.

In the radiation dominated epoch, eq. (5) can be integrated (neglecting the T-dependence of N) giving us a relationship between the age of the Universe and its temperature

$$t = \left(\frac{90}{32\pi^3 G_N N(T)}\right)^{1/2} T^{-2} \tag{21}$$

Table 1: Effective numbers of degrees of freedom in the standard model.

Temperature	New Particles	$4N(T)$
$T < m_e$	γ's + ν's	29
$m_e < T < m_\mu$	$e^\pm$	43
$m_\mu < T < m_\pi$	$\mu^\pm$	57
$m_\pi < T < Tc^*$	π's	69
$T_c < T < m_{\text{strange}}$	- π's + $u, \bar{u}, d, \bar{d}$ + gluons	205
$m_s < T < m_{charm}$	$s, \bar{s}$	247
$m_c < T < m_\tau$	$c, \bar{c}$	289
$m_\tau < T < m_{bottom}$	$\tau^\pm$	303
$m_b < T < m_{W,Z}$	$b, \bar{b}$	345
$m_{W,Z} < T < m_{top}$	$W^\pm, Z$	381
$m_t < T < m_{Higgs}$	$t, \bar{t}$	423
$M_H < T$	H^o	427

*T_c corresponds to the confinement-deconfinement transition between quarks and hadrons. $g(T) = N(T)$ is shown in Figure 2 for $T_c = 150$ and 400 MeV. It has been assumed that $m_{Higgs} > m_{top}$.

Put into a more convenient form

$$tT_{MeV}^2 = 2.4[N(T)]^{-1/2} \tag{22}$$

where t is measured in seconds and T_{MeV} in units of MeV.

The value of $N(T)$ at any given temperature depends on the particle physics model. In the standard $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ model, we can specify $N(T)$ up to temperatures of 0(100) GeV. The change in N can be seen in the following table.

At higher temperatures, $N(T)$ will be model dependent. For example, in the minimal $SU(5)$ model, one needs to add to $N(T)$, 24 states for the X and Y gauge bosons, another 24 from the adjoint Higgs, and another 6 (in addition to the 4 already counted in $W^\pm, Z$ and H) from the 5 of Higgs. Hence for $T > M_X$ in minimal $SU(5)$, $N(T) = 160.75$. In a supersymmetric model this would at least double, with some changes possibly necessary in the table if the lightest supersymmetric particle has a mass below M_H.

The notion of equilibrium also plays an important role in the standard big bang model. If, for example, the Universe were not expanding, then given enough time, every particle state would come into equilibrium with each other. Because of the expansion of the Universe, certain rates might be too slow indicating, for example, in a scattering process that the two incoming states might never find each other to bring about an interaction. Depending on their rates, certain interactions may pass in and out of thermal equilibrium during the course of the Universal expansion. Quantitatively, for each particle i, we will require that some rate Γ_i involving that type be larger than the expansion rate of the Universe or

$$\Gamma_i > H \tag{23}$$

in order to be in thermal equilibrium.

A good example for a process in equilibrium at some stage and out of equilibrium at others is that of neutrinos. If we consider the standard neutral or charged-current interactions such as $e^+ + e^- \leftrightarrow \nu + \bar{\nu}$ or $e + \nu \leftrightarrow e + \nu$ etc., very roughly the rates for these processes will be

$$\Gamma = n\langle\sigma v\rangle \tag{24}$$

Figure 2: The effective numbers of relativistic degrees of freedom as a function of temperature. The dashed lines correspond to free quarks and hadrons.

where $\langle\sigma v\rangle$ is the thermally averaged weak interaction cross section

$$\langle\sigma v\rangle\sim 0(10^{-2})T^2/M_W^4 \tag{25}$$

and n is the number density of leptons. Hence the rate for these interactions is

$$\Gamma_{\rm wk}\sim 0(10^{-2})T^5/M_W^4 \tag{26}$$

The expansion rate, on the other hand, is just

$$H = \left(\frac{8\pi G_N\rho}{3}\right)^{1/2} = \left(\frac{8\pi^3}{90}N(T)\right)^{1/2} T^2/M_P \sim 1.66N(T)^{1/2}T^2/M_P. \tag{27}$$

The Planck mass $M_P = G_N^{-1/2} = 1.22\times 10^{19}$ GeV.

Neutrinos will be in equilibrium when $\Gamma_{\rm wk} > H$ or

$$T > (500M_W^4)/M_P)^{1/3}\sim 1MeV. \tag{28}$$

The temperature at which these rates are equal is commonly referred to as the decoupling or freeze-out temperature and is defined by

$$\Gamma(T_d) = H(T_d) \tag{29}$$

For temperatures $T > T_d$, neutrinos will be in equilibrium, while for $T < T_d$ they will not. Basically, in terms of their interactions, the expansion rate is just too fast and they never *"see"* the rest of the matter in the Universe (nor themselves). Their momenta will simply redshift and their effective temperature (the shape of their momenta distribution is not changed from that of a blackbody) will simply fall with $T\sim 1/R$.

1.2 Big Bang Nucleosynthesis

An essential element of the standard cosmological model is big bang nucleosynthesis, the theory which predicts the abundances of the light element isotopes D,^{3}He, ^{4}He, and ^{7}Li. As was mentioned earlier, nucleosynthesis takes place at a temperature scale of order 1 MeV. At temperatures above 1 MeV, the weak interactions, being in equilibrium, determined the ratio of neutrons to protons. Near 1 MeV, these interactions: $n + e^+ \leftrightarrow p + \bar{\nu}$; $n + \nu \leftrightarrow p + e^-$; and $n \leftrightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}$; as the e, ν interactions discussed above, drop out of equilibrium. Although the binding energy of deuterium is 2.2 MeV, due to the high photon to baryon ratio (10^{10}), nucleosynthesis is delayed until about $T \sim 2.2/\ln 10^{10} \sim 0.1$ MeV, when deuterium can be formed without significant dissociation. Afterwhich, nucleosynthesis proceeds rapidly with the build-up of the light elements.

The nuclear processes lead primarily to ^{4}He, which is produced at about 24% by mass. Lesser amounts of the other light elements are produced: about 10^{-5} of D and ^{3}He and about 10^{-10} of ^{7}Li by number relative to H. The abundances of the light elements depend almost solely on one key parameter, the baryon-to-photon ratio, η. In figure 3, (taken from ref.[3]) the predicted abundances of the light elements are shown as a function of $\eta_{10} = 10^{10}\eta$. In figure 3, the boxes correspond to acceptable values for the abundances as determined from the observations. The band for the ^{4}He curve shows the sensitivity to the neutron half life. The vertical band shows the overall range of η in which agreement is achieved between theory and observation for all of the light elements. From the figure we see that consistency is found for

$$2.8 \times 10^{-10} < \eta < 3.2(4) \times 10^{-10} \tag{30}$$

where the bound can be as high as $\eta_{10} < 4$ when the uncertainties in ^{7}Li cross-sections are accounted for.

It is important to note that η is related to the fraction of Ω contained in baryons, Ω_B

$$\Omega_B = 3.66 \times 10^7 \eta h_o^{-2} (T_o/2.726)^3 \tag{31}$$

Using the limits on η and h_o, one finds that Ω_B is restricted to a range

$$0.01 < \Omega_B < 0.08 \tag{32}$$

and one can conclude that the Universe is not closed by baryons. This value of η is the one that we try to explain by big bang baryogenesis.

1.3 Problems with the (Non-Inflationary) Standard Model

Despite the successes of the standard big bang model, there are a number of unanswered questions that appear difficult to explain without imposing what may be called unnatural initial conditions. The resolution of these problems may lie in a unified theory of gauge interactions or possibly in a theory which includes gravity. For example, prior to the advent of grand unified theories (guts), the baryon-to-photon ratio, could have been viewed as being embarrassingly small. Although, we still do not know the precise mechanism for generating the baryon asymmetry, many quite acceptable models are available as will be discussed in some detail for the better part of these lectures. In a similar fashion, it is hoped that a field theoretic description of inflation may resolve the problems outlined below.

Figure 3: The abundances of the light elements as a function of the baryon-to-photon ratio.

1.3.1 The Curvature Problem

The bound on Ω in Eq. (13) is curious in the fact that at the present time we do not know even the sign of the curvature term in the Friedmann equation (3), i.e., we do not know if the Universe is open, closed or spatially flat.

The curvature problem (or flatness problem or age problem) can manifest itself in several ways. For a radiation dominated gas, the entropy density $s \sim T^3$ and $R \sim T^{-1}$. Thus assuming an adiabatically expanding Universe, the quantity $\hat{k} = k/R^2T^2$ is a dimensionless constant. If we now apply the limit in Eq. (13) to Eq. (12) we find

$$\hat{k} = \frac{k}{R^2T^2} = \frac{(\Omega_o - 1){H_o}^2}{{T_o}^2} < 2 \times 10^{-58} \tag{33}$$

This limit on k represents an initial condition on the cosmological model. The problem then becomes what physical processes in the early Universe produced a value of $\hat{k}$ so extraordinarily close to zero (or Ω close to one). A more natural initial condition might have been $\hat{k} \sim 0(1)$. In this case the Universe would have become curvature dominated at $T \sim 10^{-1}M_P$. For $k = +1$, this would signify the onset of recollapse. As already noted earlier, one would naturally expect the effects of curvature (seen in figure 1 by the separation of the three curves) to manifest themselves at times on the order of the Planck time as gravity should provide the only dimensionful scale in this era. If we view the evolution of Ω in figure 1 as a function of time, then the it would appear that the time $t_o = 13$ Gyr $= 7.6 \times 10^{60}{M_P}^{-1}$ ($\sim$ the current age of the Universe) appears at the far left of x-axis, ie before the curves separate. Why then has the Universe lasted so long before revealing the true sign of k?

Even for $\hat{k}$ as small as $0(10^{-40})$ the Universe would have become curvature dominated when $T \sim 10$ MeV, ie, before the onset of big bang nucleosynthesis. Of course, it is also possible that $k = 0$ and the Universe is actually spatially flat. In fact, today we would really expect only one of two possible values for Ω: 0 or 1.

1.3.2 The Horizon Problem

Because of the cosmological principle, all physical length scales grow as the scale factor $R(t) \sim t^{2/3\gamma}$, with γ defined by $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho$. However, causality implies the existence of a particle (or causal) horizon $d_H(t) \sim t$,which is the maximal physical distance light can travel from the co- moving position of an observer at some initial time ($t = 0$) to time t. For $\gamma > \frac{2}{3}$, scales originating outside of the horizon will eventually become part of our observable Universe. Hence we would expect to see anisotropies on large scales [4].

In particular, let us consider the microwave background today. The photons we observe have been decoupled since recombination at $T_d \sim 4000$K. At that time, the horizon volume was simply $V_d \propto {t_d}^3$, where t_d is the age of the Universe at $T = T_d$. Then $t_d = t_o(T_o/T_d)^{3/2} \sim 2 \times 10^5$ yrs, where $T_o = 2.726$K[1] is the present temperature of the microwave background. Our present horizon volume $V_o \propto {t_o}^3$ can be scaled back to t_d (corresponding to that part of the Universe which expanded to our present visible Universe) $V_o(t_d) \propto V_o(T_o/T_d)^3$. We can now compare $V_o(t_d)$ and V_d. The ratio

$$\frac{V_o(t_d)}{V_d} \propto \frac{V_o{T_o}^3}{V_d{T_d}^3} \propto \frac{{t_o}^3{T_o}^3}{{t_d}^3{T_d}^3} \sim 5 \times 10^4 \tag{34}$$

corresponds to the number of horizon volumes or casually distinct regions at decoupling which are encompassed in our present visible horizon.

In this context, it is astonishing that the microwave background appears highly isotropic on large scales with $\Delta T/T = 1.1 \pm 0.2 \times 10^{-5}$ at angular separations of 10^o[5]. The horizon problem, therefore, is the lack of an explanation as to why nearly 10^5 causally disconnected regions at recombination all had the same temperature to within one part in 10^{-5}.

1.3.3 Density Perturbations

Although it appears that the Universe is extremely isotropic and homogeneous on very large scales (in fact the standard model assumes complete isotropy and homogeneity) it is very inhomogeneous on small scales. In other words, there are planets, stars, galaxies, clusters, etc. On these small scales there are large density perturbations namely $\delta\rho/\rho \gg 1$. At the same time, we know from the isotropy of the microwave background that on the largest scales, $\delta\rho/\rho \sim 3\Delta T/T \sim O(10^{-5})$ [5] and these perturbations must have grown to $\delta\rho/\rho \sim 1$ on smaller scales.

In an expanding Universe, density perturbations evolve with time[6]. The evolution of the Fourier transformed quantity $\frac{\delta\rho}{\rho}(k,t)$ depends on the relative size of the wavelength $\lambda \sim k^{-1}$ and the horizon scale H^{-1}. For $k \ll H$, (always true at sufficiently early times) $\delta\rho/\rho \propto t$ while for $k \gg H$, $\delta\rho/\rho$ is $\simeq$ constant (or grows moderately as $\ln t$) assuming a radiation dominated Universe. In a matter dominated Universe, on scales larger than the Jean's length scale (determined by $k_J = 4\pi G_N \rho_{matter}/{v_s}^2$, v_s = sound speed) perturbations grow with the scale factor R. Because of the growth in $\delta\rho/\rho$, the microwave background limits force $\delta\rho/\rho$ to be extremely small at early times.

Consider a perturbation with wavelength on the order of a galactic scale. Between the Planck time and recombination, such a perturbation would have grown by a factor of $O(10^{57})$ and the anisotropy limit of $\delta\rho/\rho \lesssim 10^{-5}$ implies that $\delta\rho/\rho < 10^{-61}$ on the scale of a galaxy at the Planck time. One should compare this value with that predicted from purely random (or Poisson) fluctuations of $\delta\rho/\rho \sim 10^{-40}$ (assuming 10^{80} particles (photons) in a galaxy) [7]. The extent of this limit is of course related to the fact that the present age of the Universe is so great.

An additional problem is related to the formation time of the perturbations. A perturbation with a wavelength large enough to correspond to a galaxy today must have formed with wavelength modes much greater than the horizon size if the perturbations are primordial as is generally assumed. This is due to the fact that the wavelengths red shift as $\lambda \sim R \sim t^{1/2}$ while the horizon size grows linearly. It appears that a mechanism for generating perturbations with acausal wavelengths is required.

1.3.4 The Magnetic Monopole Problem

In addition to the much desired baryon asymmetry produced by grand unified theories, a less favorable aspect is also present; guts predict the existence of magnetic monopoles. Monopoles will be produced [8] whenever any simple group [such as $SU(5)$] is broken down to a gauge group which contains a $U(1)$ factor [such as $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$]. The mass of such a monopole would be

$$M_m \sim M_{gut}/\alpha_{gut} \sim 10^{16} GeV. \tag{35}$$

The basic reason monopoles are produced is that in the breaking of SU(5) the Higgs adjoint needed to break SU(5) cannot align itself over all space [9]. On scales larger than the horizon, for example, there is no reason to expect the direction of the Higgs field to be aligned. Because of this randomness, topological knots are expected to occur and these are the magnetic monopoles. We can then estimate that the minimum number of monopoles produced [10] would be roughly one per horizon volume or causally connected region at the time of the $SU(5)$ phase transition t_c

$$n_m \sim (2t_c)^{-3} \tag{36}$$

resulting in a monopole-to-photon ratio expressed in terms of the transition temperature of

$$\frac{n_m}{n_\gamma} \sim \left(\frac{10T_c}{M_P}\right)^3 \tag{37}$$

The overall mass density of the Universe can be used to place a constraint on the density of monopoles. For $M_m \sim 10^{16}$ GeV and $\Omega_m {h_o}^2 \lesssim 1$ we have that

$$\frac{n_m}{n_\gamma} \lesssim 0(10^{-25}) \tag{38}$$

The predicted density, however, from (37) for $T_c \sim M_{gut}$

$$\frac{n_m}{n_\gamma} \sim 10^{-9} \tag{39}$$

Hence, we see that standard guts and cosmology have a monopole problem.

1.4 Inflation

All of the problems discussed above can be neatly resolved if the Universe underwent a period of cosmological inflation [11]. During a phase transition, our assumptions of an adiabatically expanding universe may not be valid. If we look at a scalar potential describing a phase transition from a symmetric false vacuum state $\langle\phi\rangle = 0$ for some scalar field ϕ to the broken true vacuum at $\langle\phi\rangle = v$ as in figure 4, and suppose we find that upon solving the equations of motion for the scalar field that the field evolves slowly from the symmetric state to the global minimum (this will depend on the details of the potential). If the evolution is slow enough, the universe may become dominated by the vacuum energy density associated with the potential near $\eta \approx 0$. The energy density of the symmetric vacuum, V(0) acts as a cosmological constant with

$$\Lambda = 8\pi V(0){M_P}^2 \tag{40}$$

During this period of slow evolution, the energy density due, to say, radiation will fall below the vacuum energy density, $\rho \ll V(0)$. When this happens, the expansion rate will be dominated by the constant V(0) and from Eq. (3) we find an exponentially expanding solution

$$R(t) \sim e^{\sqrt{\Lambda/3}\ t} \tag{41}$$

When the field evolves towards the global minimum it will begin to oscillate about the minimum, energy will be released during its decay and a hot thermal universe will be restored. If released fast

Figure 4: A typical potential suitable for the inflationary universe scenario.

enough, it will produce radiation at a temperature ${T_R}^4 \lesssim V(0)$. In this reheating process entropy has been created and $(RT)_f > (RT)_i$. Thus we see that during a phase transition the relation $RT \sim$ constant, need not hold true and thus our dimensionless constant $\hat{k}$ may actually not have been constant.

If during the phase transition, the value of RT changed by a factor of $0(10^{29})$, the cosmological problems would be solved. The isotropy would in a sense be generated by the immense expansion; one small causal region could get blown up and hence our entire visible Universe would have been at one time in thermal contact. In addition, the parameter $\hat{k}$ could have started out 0(1) and have been driven small by the expansion. Density perturbations will be stretched by the expansion, $\lambda \sim R$. Thus it will appear that $\lambda \gg H^{-1}$ or that the perturbations have left the horizon. It is actually just that the size of the causally connected region is now no longer simply H^{-1}. However, not only does inflation offer an explanation for large scale perturbations, it also offers a source for the perturbations themselves [12]. Monopoles would also be diluted away.

The cosmological problems could be solved if

$$H\tau > 65 \tag{42}$$

where τ is the duration of the phase transition, density perturbations are produced and do not exceed the limits imposed by the microwave background anisotropy, the vacuum energy density was converted to radiation so that the reheated temperature is sufficiently high, and baryogenesis is realized.

For the purposes of discussing baryogenesis, it will be sufficient to consider only a generic model of inflation whose potential is of the form:

$$V(\eta) = \mu^4 P(\eta) \tag{43}$$

where η is the scalar field driving inflation, the inflaton, μ is an as yet unspecified mass parameter, and $P(\eta)$ is a function of η which possesses the features necessary for inflation, but contains no small parameters. I.e. $P(\eta)$ takes the form,

$$P(\eta) = P(o) + m^2\eta^2 + \lambda_3\eta^3 + \lambda_4\eta^4 + ... \tag{44}$$

where all of the couplings in P are $O(1)$ and ... refers to possible non-renormalizable terms. Most of the useful inflationary potentials can be put into the form of Eq. (43).

The requirements for successful inflation boil down to: 1) enough inflation;

$$\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \eta^2} \,|_{\eta\sim\eta_i \pm H} < \frac{3H^2}{65} = \frac{8\pi V(0)}{65{M_P}^2} \tag{45}$$

2) density perturbations of the right magnitude[12];

$$\frac{\delta\rho}{\rho} \simeq \frac{H^2}{10\pi^{3/2}\dot{\eta}} \simeq \begin{cases} \left(\frac{32\lambda_4}{3\pi^3}\right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{10} \ln^{3/2}(Hk^{-1}) \frac{\mu^2}{{M_P}^2} \\ \left(\frac{\lambda_3}{H\pi^{3/2}}\right) \frac{1}{10} \ln^2(Hk^{-1}) \frac{\mu^4}{{M_P}^4} \\ \left(\frac{8}{3\pi^2}\right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{10} \frac{m}{M_P} \ln(Hk^{-1}) \frac{\mu^2}{{M_P}^2} \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

given here for scales which "re-enter" the horizon during the matter dominated era. These reduce approximately to

$$\frac{\delta\rho}{\rho} \sim O(100)\frac{\mu^2}{{M_P}^2} \tag{47}$$

3) baryogenesis; the subject of the remaining lectures.

For large scale fluctuations of the type measured by COBE[5], we can use Eq. (47) to fix the inflationary scale μ. The magnitude of the density fluctuations can be related to the observed quadrupole[13] moment:

$$\langle a_2^2 \rangle = \frac{5}{6} 2\pi^2 (\frac{\delta\rho}{\rho})^2 \tag{48}$$

The observed quadrupole moment gives [5]:

$$\langle a_2^2 \rangle = (4.7 \pm 2) \times 10^{-10} \tag{49}$$

or

$$\frac{\delta\rho}{\rho} = (5.4 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-6} \tag{50}$$

which in turn fixes the coefficient μ of the inflaton potential[14]:

$$\frac{\mu^2}{M_P^2} = \text{few} \times 10^{-8} \tag{51}$$

Fixing (μ^2/M_P^2) has immediate general consequences for inflation[15]. For example, the Hubble parameter during inflation, $H^2 \simeq (8\pi/3)(\mu^4/M_P^2)$ so that $H \sim 10^{-7}M_P$. The duration of inflation is $\tau \simeq M_P^3/\mu^4$, and the number of e-foldings of expansion is $H\tau \sim 8\pi(M_P^2/\mu^2) \sim 10^9$. If the inflaton decay rate goes as $\Gamma \sim m_\eta^3/M_P^2 \sim \mu^6/M_P^5$, the universe recovers at a temperature $T_R \sim (\Gamma M_P)^{1/2} \sim \mu^3/M_P^2 \sim 10^{-11}M_P \sim 10^8 GeV$. Recall that before COBE all that could be set was an upper limit on μ.

2 Big Bang Baryogenesis

It appears that there is apparently very little antimatter in the Universe and that the number of photons greatly exceeds the number of baryons. In the standard model, the entropy density today is related to n_γ by

$$s \sim 7n_\gamma \tag{52}$$

so that eq. (30) implies $n_B/s \sim 4 \times 10^{-11}$. In the absence of baryon number violation or entropy production this ratio is conserved however and hence represents a potentially undesirable initial condition.

Let us for the moment, assume that in fact $\eta = 0$. We can compute the final number density of nucleons left over after annihilations of baryons and antibaryons have frozen out. At very high temperatures (neglecting a quark-hadron transition) $T > 1$ GeV, nucleons were in thermal equilibrium with the photon background and $n_B = n_{\bar{B}} = (3/2)n_\gamma$ (a factor of 2 accounts for neutrons and protons and the factor 3/4 for the difference between fermi and bose statistics). As the temperature fell below m_N annihilations kept the nucleon density at its equilibrium value $(n_B/n_\gamma) = (m_N/T)^{3/2}\exp(-m_N/T)$ until the annihilation rate $\Gamma_A \simeq n_B m_\pi^{-2}$ fell below the expansion rate.

This occurred at $T \simeq 20$ MeV. However, at this time the nucleon number density had already dropped to

$$n_B/n_\gamma = n_{\bar{B}}/n_\gamma \simeq 10^{-18} \tag{53}$$

which is eight orders of magnitude too small [16] aside from the problem of having to separate the baryons from the antibaryons. If any separation did occur at higher temperatures (so that annihilations were as yet incomplete) the maximum distance scale on which separation could occur is the causal scale related to the age of the Universe at that time. At $T = 20$ MeV, the age of the Universe was only $t = 2 \times 10^{-3}$ sec. At that time, a causal region (with distance scale defined by 2ct) could only have contained $10^{-5} M_\odot$ which is very far from the galactic mass scales which we are asking for separations to occur, $10^{12} M_\odot$. In spite of all of these problems, $\eta = 0$, implies that the Universe as a whole is baryon symmetric, thus unless baryons are separated on extremely large (inflationary) domains, in which case we might just as well worry again about $\eta \neq 0$, there should be antimatter elsewhere in the Universe. To date, the only antimatter observed is the result of a high energy collision, either in an accelerator or in a cosmic-ray collision in the atmosphere. There has been no sign to date of any primary antimatter, such as an anti-helium nucleus $\bar{\alpha}$ found in cosmic-rays.

2.1 The out-of-equilibrium decay scenario

The production of a net baryon asymmetry requires baryon number violating interactions, C and CP violation and a departure from thermal equilibrium[17]. The first two of these ingredients are contained in guts, the third can be realized in an expanding universe where as we have seen, it is not uncommon that interactions come in and out of equilibrium. In SU(5), the fact that quarks and leptons are in the same multiplets allows for baryon non-conserving interactions such as $e^- + d \leftrightarrow \bar{u} + \bar{u}$, etc., or decays of the supermassive gauge bosons X and Y such as $X \to e^- + d, \bar{u} + \bar{u}$. Although today these interactions are very ineffective because of the very large masses of the X and Y bosons, in the early Universe when $T \sim M_X \sim 10^{15}$ GeV these types of interactions should have been very important. C and CP violation is very model dependent. In the minimal SU(5) model, as we will see, the magnitude of C and CP violation is too small to yield a useful value of η. The C and CP violation in general comes from the interference between tree level and first loop corrections.

The departure from equilibrium is very common in the early Universe when interaction rates cannot keep up with the expansion rate. In fact, the simplest (and most useful) scenario for baryon production makes use of the fact that a single decay rate goes out of equilibrium. It is commonly referred to as the out of equilibrium decay scenario [18]. The basic idea is that the gauge bosons X and Y (or Higgs bosons) may have a lifetime long enough to insure that the inverse decays have already ceased so that the baryon number is produced by their free decays.

More specifically, let us call X, either the gauge boson or Higgs boson, which produces the baryon asymmetry through decays. Let α be its coupling to fermions. For X a gauge boson, α will be the GUT fine structure constant, while for X a Higgs boson, $(4\pi\alpha)^{1/2}$ will be the Yukawa coupling to fermions. The decay rate for X will be

$$\Gamma_D \simeq \alpha M_X \tag{54}$$

However decays can only begin occurring when the age of the Universe is longer than the X lifetime Γ_D^{-1}, i.e., when $\Gamma_D >$ H

$$\alpha M_X \gtrsim N(T)^{1/2} T^2 / M_P \tag{55}$$

or at a temperature

$$T^2 \lesssim \alpha M_X M_P N(T)^{-1/2}. \tag{56}$$

Scatterings on the other hand proceed at a rate $\Gamma_S \sim \alpha^2 T^3 / M_X^2$ and hence are not effective at lower temperatures. To be in equilibrium, decays must have been effective as T fell below M_X in order to track the equilibrium density of X's (and $\bar{X}$'s). Therefore, the out-of-equilibrium condition is that at $T = M_X, \Gamma_D < H$ or

$$M_X \gtrsim \alpha M_P (N(M_X))^{-1/2} \sim 10^{18} \alpha \mathrm{GeV} \tag{57}$$

In this case, we would expect a maximal net baryon asymmetry to be produced.

To see the role of C and CP violation, consider the two channels for the decay of an X gauge boson: $X \to (1) \bar{u}\bar{u}, (2) e^- d$. Suppose that the branching ratio into the first channel with baryon number $B = -2/3$ is r and that of the second channel with baryon number $B = +1/3$ is $1 - r$. Suppose in addition that the branching ratio for $\bar{X}$ into $(\bar{1})$ u u with baryon number $B = +2/3$ is $\bar{r}$ and into $(\bar{2})$ $e^+ \bar{d}$ with baryon number $B = -1/3$ is $1 - \bar{r}$. Though the total decay rates of X and $\bar{X}$ (normalized to unity) are equal as required by CPT invariance, the differences in the individual branching ratios signify a violation of C and CP conservation.

The (partial) decay rate for X is computed from an invariant transition rate

$$W = \frac{s}{2^n} |\mathcal{M}|^2 (2\pi)^4 \delta^4 (\Sigma P) \tag{58}$$

where the first term is the common symmetry factor and the decay rate is

$$\Gamma = \frac{1}{2M_X} \int W d\Pi_1 d\Pi_2 \tag{59}$$

with

$$d\Pi = \frac{g d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3 2E} \tag{60}$$

for g degrees of freedom. Denote the parity (P) of the states (1) and (2) by $\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$, then we have the following transformation properties:

$$\begin{array}{lrcl} \text{Under CPT :} & \Gamma(X \to 1\uparrow) & = & \Gamma(\bar{1}\downarrow \to \bar{X}) \\ \text{Under CP :} & \Gamma(X \to 1\uparrow) & = & \Gamma(\bar{X} \to \bar{1}\downarrow) \\ \text{Under C :} & \Gamma(X \to 1\uparrow) & = & \Gamma(\bar{X} \to \bar{1}\uparrow) \end{array} \tag{61}$$

We can now denote

$$r = \Gamma(X \to 1\uparrow) + \Gamma(X \to 1\downarrow) \tag{62}$$

$$\bar{r} = \Gamma(\bar{X} \to \bar{1}\uparrow) + \Gamma(\bar{X} \to \bar{1}\downarrow) \tag{63}$$

The total baryon number produced by an X, $\bar{X}$ decay is then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta B &= -\frac{2}{3} r + \frac{1}{3}(1 - r) + \frac{2}{3}\bar{r} - \frac{1}{3}(1 - \bar{r}) \\ &= \bar{r} - r = \Gamma(\bar{X} \to \bar{1}\uparrow) + \Gamma(\bar{X} \to \bar{1}\downarrow) - \Gamma(X \to 1\uparrow) - \Gamma(X \to 1\downarrow) \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

One sees clearly therefore, that from eqs. (61) if *either* C *or* CP are good symmetries, $\Delta B = 0$.

In the out-of-equilibrium decay scenario [18], the total baryon asymmetry produced is proportional to $\Delta B = (\bar{r} - r)$. If decays occur out-of-equilibrium, then at the time of decay, $n_X \approx n_\gamma$ at $T < M_X$. We then have

$$\frac{n_B}{s} = \frac{(\Delta B) n_X}{s} \sim \frac{(\Delta B) n_X}{N(T) n_\gamma} \sim 10^{-2} (\Delta B) \tag{65}$$

The schematic view presented above can be extended to a complete calculation given a specific model [19, 20], see also [21] for reviews. It makes sense to first consider the simplest GUT, namely SU(5) (for a complete discussion of GUTs see [22]. In SU(5), the standard model fermions are placed in a $\bar{5}$ and 10 representation of SU(5)

$$\begin{pmatrix} d_1^c \\ d_2^c \\ d_3^c \\ e \\ \nu \end{pmatrix}_L = \bar{\mathbf{5}} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u_3^c & -u_2^c & -u_1 & -d_1 \\ & 0 & u_1^c & -u_2 & -d_2 \\ & & 0 & -u_3 & -d_3 \\ & & & 0 & -e^c \\ & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}_L = \mathbf{10} \tag{66}$$

where the subscripts are SU(3)-color indices. The standard model gauge sector is augmented by the color triplet X and Y gauge bosons which form a doublet under $SU(2)_L$ and have electric charges $\pm 4/3$ and $\pm 1/3$ respectively. The full set of 24 gauge bosons are in the adjoint representation. In minimal SU(5), an adjoint of Higgs scalars, Σ, is required for the breakdown of SU(5) to the standard model $SU(3)_c\times$ $SU(2)_L\times$ $U(1)_Y$. The additional Higgs scalars needed to break the standard model down to $SU(3)_c\times$ $U(1)_{em}$ requires a five-plet of scalars, H, which contains the standard model Higgs doublet in addition to a colored (charged $\pm 1/3$) triplet.

The SU(5) gauge couplings to fermions can be written as [23]

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} g_5 X_{i\mu} \left(\bar{d}_{iR} \gamma^\mu e_R^+ + \epsilon_{ijk} \bar{u^c_{k}}_L \gamma^u u_{j\,L} + \bar{d}_{iL} \gamma^\mu e_L^+ \right) \tag{67}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} g_5 Y_{i\mu} \left(-\bar{d}_{iR} \gamma^\mu {\nu^c}_R + \epsilon_{ijk} \bar{u^c_{j}}_L \gamma^u d_{kL} - \bar{u}_{iL} \gamma^\mu e_L^+ \right) \tag{68}$$

where g_5 is the SU(5) gauge coupling constant. These couplings lead to the decays shown in figure 5. Similar diagrams can be drawn for the decay of the Y gauge boson.

The Higgs five-plet, H couples to fermions via the

$$\mathbf{H}\ \bar{\mathbf{5}}\ \mathbf{10} \qquad \mathbf{H}\ \mathbf{10}\ \mathbf{10} \tag{69}$$

couplings shown in figure 6 (shown are the couplings of the triplet relevant for baryogenesis).

Typically, it is expected that the Higgs masses, in particular, those of the adjoint, Σ, are of order the GUT scale, $M_X \sim 10^{15} - 10^{16}$ GeV. The five-plet is somewhat problematic however, as the the doublet in H, must remain light as it corresponds to the standard model electroweak Higgs doublet. The triplet can not be light because as a consequence of the diagrams in figure 6, it will mediate proton decay. However, because the couplings to fermions in figure 6 are Yukawa couplings rather than gauge couplings, the calculated rate for proton decay mediated by the triplets will be much smaller, allowing for a smaller triplet mass

$$\frac{\Gamma(p - \mathrm{decayvia}X)}{\Gamma(p - \mathrm{decayvia}H)} \sim \left(\frac{M_H}{M_X} \right)^4 \left(\frac{M_W}{m_q} \right)^4 \tag{70}$$

Figure 5: Decay diagrams for the X gauge boson.

Figure 6: Higgs couplings to fermions.

Figure 7: One loop contribution to the C and CP violation in SU(5).

implying that the Higgs triplet mass M_H need only be greater than about 10^{10} GeV.

From equation (65) it is clear that a complete calculation of n_B/s will require a calculation of the CP violation in the decays (summed over parities) which we can parameterize by

$$\epsilon = \bar{r} - r = \frac{\Gamma(\bar{X} \to \bar{1}) - \Gamma(X \to 1)}{\Gamma(\bar{X} \to \bar{1}) + \Gamma(X \to 1)} \sim \frac{\mathrm{Im}\Gamma}{\mathrm{Re}\Gamma} \tag{71}$$

At the tree level, as one can see $\Gamma(X \to 1) \propto g_5^\dagger g_5$ is real and there is no C or CP violation. At the one loop level, one finds that the interference between the tree diagram and the loop diagram shown in figure 7 gives [24]

$$\epsilon \propto \mathrm{Im} g_{X_1}^\dagger g_{Y_1} g_{X_2} g_{Y_2}^\dagger \tag{72}$$

However in SU(5), $g_{X_1} = g_{Y_1} = g_{X_2} = g_{Y_2} = g_5$ so that

$$\epsilon \propto \mathrm{Im}(g_5^\dagger g_5)(g_5 g_5^\dagger) = 0 \tag{73}$$

Similarly, the exchange of the Higgs triplet at one loop also gives a vanishing contribution to ϵ.

At least two Higgs five-plets are therefore required to generate sufficient C and CP violation. (It is possible within minimal SU(5) to generate a non- vanishing ϵ at 3 loops, however its magnitude would be too small for the purpose of generating a baryon asymmetry.) With two five-plets, H and H', the interference of diagrams of the type in figure 8, will yield a non-vanishing ϵ,

$$\epsilon \propto \mathrm{Im}(a'^\dagger a b' b^\dagger) \neq 0 \tag{74}$$

if the couplings $a \neq a'$ and $b \neq b'$.

Given the grand unified theory, SU(5) in this case, the final task in computing the baryon asymmetry is to take into account the thermal history of the Universe and the departure from thermal equilibrium [25, 18]. A full complete numerical calculation was undertaken in [19] and these results will be briefly summarized here.

To trace the evolution of the baryon asymmetry contained in quarks, a full set of coupled differential Boltzmann equations must be computed for all relevant particle species. In general,

Figure 8: One loop contribution to the C and CP violation with two Higgs five-plets.

particle number densities must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{n} + 3Hn \quad = \quad & \int d\Pi_a d\Pi_b \cdots d\Pi_i d\Pi_j \cdots \\ & [f_a f_b \cdots (1 \pm f_i)(1 \pm f_j) \cdots W(p_a p_b \cdots \to p_i p_j \cdots) \\ & -f_i f_j \cdots (1 \pm f_a)(1 \pm f_b) \cdots W(p_i p_j \cdots \to p_a p_b \cdots)] \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

where

$$n = 2 \int E f d\Pi \qquad f = \frac{F(t)}{e^{E/T} \pm 1} \tag{76}$$

is the number density of particles and the energy distribution. In thermal equilibrium $F = 1$ and is allowed to take other values. Since we are interested in an asymmetry it is more convenient to keep track of the quantities

$$n_{i+} = n_i + n_{\bar{i}} \qquad n_{i-} = n_i - n_{\bar{i}} \tag{77}$$

For small asymmetries, $F_+ \simeq 2$ and F_- is small. In total, it is necessary to keep track of the following 12 quantities: $U_+, D_+, L_+, \nu_+, X_+, Y_+; U_-, D_-, L_-, \nu_-, X_-, Y_-$ where these scaled functions are defined by $U(t) = n_u/(g_u A)$ with $A = [3\zeta(3)/4\pi^2]T^3$. It is also convenient to change time variables from $\frac{d}{dt}$ to $\frac{d}{dz} = \frac{5.8\times10^{17}\mathrm{GeV}}{M_X^2}\left(\frac{160}{N(T)}\right)^{1/2} z\frac{d}{dt}$, with $z = M_X/T$.

The full set of coupled equations can be found in [19]. For our purposes here, it will be useful to write down only a sample equation for U_-

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{zK}\frac{dU_-}{dz} \quad = \quad & -\gamma_{\mathrm{D}}\,[2X_- + Y_-/2] - \gamma_{\mathrm{ID}}\,[2U_+U_- + (U_+D_- + D_+U_-)/2 \\ & (U_+L_- + L_+U_-)/4] + \epsilon\,[\gamma_{\mathrm{D}}X_+ - \gamma_{\mathrm{ID}}D_+L_+/2] + \mathrm{scatterings}\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where

$$\gamma_{\mathrm{D}} = \frac{1}{\alpha M_X}\frac{4}{3}\frac{\int d\Pi_X d\Pi_{u_1} d\Pi_{u_2} f_X W(X \to u_1 u_2)}{g_X \zeta(3) T^3/\pi^2} \tag{79}$$

$$\gamma_{\mathrm{ID}} = \frac{1}{\alpha M_X}\frac{4}{3}\frac{\int d\Pi_X d\Pi_{u_1} d\Pi_{u_2} f_{u_1} f_{u_2} W(u_1 u_2 \to X)}{g_X \zeta(3) T^3/\pi^2} \tag{80}$$

$$K = \frac{2.9 \times 10^{17}\alpha\mathrm{GeV}}{M_X}\left(\frac{160}{N(T)}\right)^{1/2} \tag{81}$$

Figure 9: The damping of an initial baryon asymmetry with $B-L=0$ and $\epsilon=0$.

where the gut fine-structure constant is $\alpha = g_5^2/4\pi$.

When equilibrium is maintained and all interaction rates are large compared with the expansion rate, solutions to the + equations (not shown) give $U_+, D_+, L_+, \nu_+ = 2$ and $X_+ = Y_+ = 2\gamma_{\rm ID}/\gamma_{\rm D}$. In this case, as one can see from the sample $-$ equation in (78), all CP violation effects disappear (the coefficient of ϵ vanishes). As the ϵ term was the only one that could generate an asymmetry, the asymmetry is driven to 0 in equilibrium.

To get a feeling for the results of such a numerical integration, let us first consider the case with $\epsilon = 0$. When $B-L=0$ initially, there is a damping of any initial baryon asymmetry as is shown in figure 9. The parameter z, increases as a function of time ($z \sim \sqrt{t}$). In equilibrium, the asymmetries are damped until the baryon number violating interactions freeze-out. In accord with our earlier remarks, a large value of M_X (corresponding to a small value of K) results in an early departure from equilibrium and a larger final baryon asymmetry. If $B-L \neq 0$ initially, since the minimal SU(5) considered here conserves $B-L$, the asymmetry can not be erased, only reshuffled.

To generate an asymmetry, we must have $\epsilon \neq 0$. The time evolution for the generation of a baryon asymmetry is shown in figure 10. As one can see, for large values of M_X, ie. values which satisfy the lower limit given in eq. (57), the maximal value for the baryon asymmetry, $n_B/s \sim 10^{-2}\epsilon$ is achieved. This confirms numerically the original out-of equilibrium decay scenario [18]. For smaller values of M_X, an asymmetry is still produced, which however is smaller due to partial equilibrium maintained by inverse decays ($\gamma_{\rm ID}$). The growth of the asymmetry as a function

Figure 10: The time evolution of the baryon asymmetry with $B = L = 0$ initially.

of time is now damped, and it reaches its final value when inverse decays freeze out.

Finally it is important to note that the results for the final baryon asymmetry, as shown in figure 10, as a function of the mass of the X gauge boson, is in fact largely independent of the initial baryon asymmetry. This is evidenced in figure 11, which shows the time evolution of the asymmetry, given a large initial asymmetry. Even for large M_X, the asymmetry is slightly damped, and for smaller values of M_X, the asymmetry is damped to a level which is again determined by the freeze-out of inverse decays. This means that this mechanism of baryogenesis is truely independent of initial conditions, in particular it gives the same value for η whether or not $\eta = 0$ or 1 initially.

The out-of-equilibrium decay scenario discussed above did not include the effects of an inflationary epoch. In the context of inflation, one must in addition ensure baryogenesis after inflation as any asymmetry produced before inflation would be inflated away along with magnetic monopoles and any other unwanted relic. Reheating after inflation, may require a Higgs sector with a relatively light $O(10^{10} - 10^{11}) GeV$ Higgs boson. The light Higgs is necessary since the inflaton, η, is typically very light ($m_\eta \sim \mu^2/M_P \sim O(10^{11})$ GeV, determined from the magnitude of density perturbations on large scales as measured by COBE[5], cf. eq. (51)) and the baryon number violating Higgs would have to be produced during inflaton decay. Note that a “light” Higgs is acceptable as discussed above due to the reduced couplings to fermions cf. eq.(70). The out-of-equilibrium decay scenario would now be realized by Higgs boson decay rather than gauge boson decay and a different sequence of events. First the inflaton would be required to decay to Higgs bosons (triplets?) and subsequently the triplets would decay rapidly by the processes shown in figure 6. These decays

Figure 11: The time evolution of the baryon asymmetry with a large initial baryon asymmetry.

would be well out of equilibrium as at reheating $T \ll m_H$ and $n_H \sim n_\gamma$ [26]. In this case, the baryon asymmetry is given simply by

$$\frac{n_B}{s} \sim \epsilon \frac{n_H}{{T_R}^3} \sim \epsilon \frac{n_\eta}{{T_R}^3} \sim \epsilon \frac{T_R}{m_\eta} \sim \epsilon \left(\frac{m_\eta}{M_P} \right)^{1/2} \sim \epsilon \frac{\mu}{M_P} \sim 10^{-4} \epsilon \tag{82}$$

where T_R is the reheat temperature after inflation, and I have substituted for $n_\eta = \rho_\eta / m_\eta \sim \Gamma^2 {M_P}^2 / m_\eta$.

2.2 Supersymmetry

Supersymmetry, as is well known by now, was incorporated into GUTs because of its ability to resolve the gauge hierarchy problems. There are two aspects to this problem: 1) there is a separation in physical mass scales, $M_W \ll M_X < M_P$; 2) this separation is extremely sensitive to radiative corrections. The first problem has to do with a tree-level choice of mass parameters. A single fine-tuning. The second problem requires fine-tuning at many successive orders in perturbation theory. Radiative corrections to scalar masses are quadratically divergent

$$\delta m_o^2 \sim g^2 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi^4)} \frac{1}{k^2} \sim 0(\alpha/\pi)\Lambda^2 \tag{83}$$

where Λ is some cut-off scale. In the low energy electroweak theory, the smallness of M_W requires the mass of the physical Higgs boson to be $m_H < 0(1)$TeV. Requiring $\delta m_H^2 < 0(m_H^2)$ implies that $\Lambda < 0(1)$ TeV as well. The trouble comes when we move to a GUT where the natural cut-off is M_X (or even M_P) rather than $0(M_W)$ and we expect $\delta m_H^2 > 0(10^{15})$ GeV. A cancellation may be imposed by hand, but this must be done to each order in perturbation theory. A solution to this difficulty would be to cancel the radiative corrections by including fermion loops which have the opposite sign. Then provided $|m_B^2 - m_F^2| < 0(1)$ TeV, the stability of the mass scales would be guaranteed. Such a cancellation occurs automatically in a supersymmetric theory (in the limit of exact supersymmetry, these radiative corrections are absent entirely). In addition, although gauge couplings still get renormalized, the Yukawa couplings of theory, which are parameters of a superpotential do not get renormalized[27].

Standard unification (ie. non-supersymmetric) has come across additional difficulties of late. Extrapolation of the gauge coupling constants of the standard model using the renormalization group equation with standard model inputs, does not result in the three couplings meeting at a single point. However, when the superpartners of the standard model fields are also incorporated, and the renormalization group equations are again run to high energy scales, then the gauge couplings do in fact meet at a point (within errors) at a scale of order 10^{16} GeV [28].

The field content of the supersymmetric standard model, consists of the following chiral supermultiplets: $Q, u^c, d^c, L, e^c, H_1, H_2$. The only addition is the extra Higgs doublet. The Yukawa interactions are generated by the superpotential

$$F_Y = h_u H_1 Q u_c + h_d H_2 Q d^c + h_l H_2 L e^c + \epsilon H_1 H_2 \tag{84}$$

leading to the Lagrangian interactions

$$\mathcal{L} \ni \left(\partial^2 F_Y / \partial \phi^i \partial \phi^j \right) \Psi^i \Psi^j \tag{85}$$

where Ψ^i is the fermion component of the superfield ϕ^i. (85) contains the normal fermion mass terms of the standard model.

The scalar potential in a globally supersymmetric theory can be written as

$$V(\phi^i, \phi_i^*) = \Sigma_i |F_i|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma_a g_a^2 |D^a|^2 \tag{86}$$

where

$$F_i = \partial F / \partial \phi^i \tag{87}$$

for superpotential F and

$$|D^a|^2 = \left(\Sigma_{i,j} \phi_i^* T^{ai}_{\ \ j} \phi^j \right)^2 \tag{88}$$

for generators $T^{ai}_{\ \ j}$ of a gauge group with gauge coupling g_a. In addition, in broken supersymmetry there will be soft supersymmetry breaking scalar masses as well as gaugino masses.

In a supersymmetric grand unified SU(5) theory, the superpotential F_Y can be expressed in terms of SU(5) multiplets

$$F_Y = h_d \mathbf{H_2}\ \bar{\mathbf{5}}\ \mathbf{10} + h_u \mathbf{H_1}\ \mathbf{10}\ \mathbf{10} \tag{89}$$

where $10, \bar{5}, H_1$ and H_2 are chiral supermultiplets for the 10, and $\bar{5}$ plets of SU(5) matter fields and the Higgs 5 and $\bar{5}$ multiplets respectively.

In supersymmetric SU(5), there are now new dimension 5 operators which violate baryon number and lead to proton decay as shown in figure 12. The first of these diagrams leads to effective dimension 5 Lagrangian terms such as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{(5)} = \frac{h_u h_d}{M_H} (\tilde{q}\tilde{q}ql) \tag{90}$$

and the resulting dimension 6 operator for proton decay [29]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{h_u h_d}{M_H} \left(\frac{g_2^2}{M_{\tilde{W}}} \text{or} \frac{g_1^2}{M_{\tilde{B}}} \right) (qqql) \tag{91}$$

As a result of these diagrams the proton decay rate scales as $\Gamma \sim h^4 g^4 / M_H^2 M_{\tilde{G}}^2$ where M_H is the triplet mass, and $M_{\tilde{G}}$ is a typical gaugino mass of order $\lesssim$ 1 TeV. This rate however is much too large if $M_H \sim 10^{10}$ GeV.

It is however possible to have a lighter ($O(10^{10} - 10^{11})$ GeV) Higgs triplet needed for baryogenesis in the out-of-equilibrium decay scenario with inflation. One needs two pairs of Higgs five-plets (H_1, H_2 and H_1', H_2' which is anyway necessary to have sufficient C and CP violation in the decays. By coupling one pair (H_2 and H_1') only to the third generation of fermions via [30]

$$a\mathbf{H_1 10 10} + b\mathbf{H_1' 10_3 10_3} + c\mathbf{H_2 10_3 \bar{5}_3} + d\mathbf{H_2' 10 \bar{5}} \tag{92}$$

proton decay can not be induced by the dimension five operators. Triplet decay will however generate a baryon asymmetry proportional to $\epsilon \sim \text{Im} dc^\dagger ba^\dagger$.

Figure 12: Dimension 5 and induced dimension 6 graphs violating baryon number.

2.3 The Affleck-Dine Mechanism

Another mechanism for generating the cosmological baryon asymmetry is the decay of scalar condensates as first proposed by Affleck and Dine[31]. This mechanism is truly a product of supersymmetry. It is straightforward though tedious to show that there are many directions in field space such that the scalar potential given in eq. (86) vanishes identically when SUSY is unbroken. That is, with a particular assignment of scalar vacuum expectation values, $V = 0$ in both the $F-$ and $D-$ terms. An example of such a direction is

$$u_3^c = a \qquad s_2^c = a \qquad -u_1 = v \qquad \mu^- = v \qquad b_1^c = e^{i\phi}\sqrt{v^2 + a^2} \tag{93}$$

where a, v are arbitrary complex vacuum expectation values. SUSY breaking lifts this degeneracy so that

$$V \simeq \tilde{m}^2 \phi^2 \tag{94}$$

where $\tilde{m}$ is the SUSY breaking scale and ϕ is the direction in field space corresponding to the flat direction. For large initial values of ϕ, $\phi_o \sim M_{gut}$, a large baryon asymmetry can be generated[31, 32]. This requires the presence of baryon number violating operators such as $O = qqql$ such that $\langle O \rangle \neq 0$. The decay of these condensates through such an operator can lead to a net baryon asymmetry.

In a supersymmetric gut, as we have seen above, there are precisely these types of operators. In figure 13, a 4-scalar diagram involving the fields of the flat direction (93) is shown. Again, $\tilde{G}$ is a (light) gaugino. The two supersymmetry breaking insertions are of order $\tilde{m}$, so that the diagram produces an effective quartic coupling of order $\tilde{m}^2/(\phi_o^2 + M_X^2)$.

The baryon asymmetry produced, is computed by tracking the evolution of the sfermion condensate, which is determined by

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} = -\tilde{m}^2 \phi \tag{95}$$

To see how this works, it is instructive to consider a toy model with potential [32]

$$V(\phi, \phi^*) = \tilde{m}^2 \phi \phi^* + \frac{1}{2} i\lambda[\phi^4 - \phi^{*4}] \tag{96}$$

Figure 13: Baryon number violating diagram involving flat direction fields.

The equation of motion becomes

$$\ddot{\phi}_1 + 3H\dot{\phi}_1 = -\tilde{m}^2\phi_1 + 3\lambda\phi_1^2\phi_2 - \lambda\phi_2^3 \qquad (97)$$

$$\ddot{\phi}_2 + 3H\dot{\phi}_2 = -\tilde{m}^2\phi_2 - 3\lambda\phi_2^2\phi_1 + \lambda\phi_1^3 \qquad (98)$$

with $\phi = (\phi_1 + i\phi_2)/\sqrt{2}$. Initially, when the expansion rate of the Universe, H, is large, we can neglect $\ddot{\phi}$ and $\tilde{m}$. As one can see from (96) the flat direction lies along $\phi \simeq \phi_1 \simeq \phi_o$ with $\phi_2 \simeq 0$. In this case, $\dot{\phi}_1 \simeq 0$ and $\dot{\phi}_2 \simeq \frac{\lambda}{3H}\phi_o^3$. Since the baryon density can be written as $n_B = j_o = \frac{1}{2}(\phi_1\dot{\phi}_2 - \phi_2\dot{\phi}_1) \simeq \frac{\lambda}{6H}\phi_o^4$, by generating some motion in the imaginary ϕ direction, we have generated a net baryon density.

When H has fallen to order $\tilde{m}$ (when $t^{-1} \sim \tilde{m}$), ϕ_1 begins to oscillate about the origin with $\phi_1 \simeq \phi_o \sin(\tilde{m}t)/\tilde{m}t$ At this point the baryon number generated is conserved and the baryon density, n_B falls as R^{-3}. Thus,

$$n_B \sim \frac{\lambda}{\tilde{m}}\phi_o^2\phi^2 \propto R^{-3} \qquad (99)$$

and relative to the number density of ϕ's ($n_\phi = \rho_\phi/\tilde{m} = \tilde{m}\phi^2$)

$$\frac{n_B}{n_\phi} \simeq \frac{\lambda\phi_o^2}{\tilde{m}^2} \qquad (100)$$

If it is assumed that the energy density of the Universe is dominated by ϕ, then the oscillations will cease, when

$$\Gamma_\phi \simeq \frac{\tilde{m}^3}{\phi^2} \simeq H \simeq \frac{\rho_\phi^{1/2}}{M_P} \simeq \frac{\tilde{m}\phi}{M_P} \qquad (101)$$

or when the amplitude of oscillations has dropped to $\phi_D \simeq (M_P\tilde{m}^2)^{1/3}$. Note that the decay rate is suppressed as fields coupled directly to ϕ gain masses $\propto \phi$. It is now straightforward to compute the baryon to entropy ratio,

$$\frac{n_B}{s} = \frac{n_B}{\rho_\phi^{3/4}} \simeq \frac{\lambda\phi_o^2\phi_D^2}{\tilde{m}^{5/2}\phi_D^{3/2}} = \frac{\lambda\phi_o^2}{\tilde{m}^2}\left(\frac{M_P}{\tilde{m}}\right)^{1/6} \qquad (102)$$

and after inserting the quartic coupling

$$\frac{n_B}{s} \simeq \epsilon \frac{\phi_o^2}{(M_X^2 + \phi_o^2)} \left(\frac{M_P}{\tilde{m}}\right)^{1/6} \tag{103}$$

which could be quite large.

In the context of inflation, a couple of significant changes to the scenario take place. First, it is more likely that the energy density is dominated by the inflaton rather than the sfermion condensate. Second, the the initial value (after inflation) of the condensate ϕ can be determined by the inflaton mass m_η, ${\phi_o}^2 \simeq H^3\tau \simeq m_\eta M_P$. The sequence of events leading to a baryon asymmetry is then as follows [15]: After inflation, oscillations of of the inflaton begin at $R = R_\eta$ when $H \sim m_\eta$ and oscillations of the sfermions begin at $R = R_\phi$ when $H \sim \tilde{m}$. If the Universe is inflaton dominated, $H \sim m_\eta (R_\eta/R)^{3/2}$ since $H \sim \rho_\eta^{1/2}$ and $\rho_\eta \sim \eta^2 \sim R^{-3}$ Thus one can relate R_η and R_ϕ, $R_\phi \simeq (m_\eta/\tilde{m})^{2/3} R_\eta$. As discussed earlier, inflatons decay when $\Gamma_\eta = m_\eta^3/M_P^2 = H$ or when $R = R_{d\eta} \simeq (M_p/m_\eta)^{4/3} R_\eta$. The Universe then becomes dominated by the relativistic decay products of the inflaton, $\rho_{r\eta} = m_\eta^{2/3} M_P^{10/3} (R_\eta/R)^4$ and $H = m_\eta^{1/3} M_P^{2/3} (R_\eta/R)^2$. Sfermion decays still occur when $\Gamma_\phi = H$ which now corresponds to a value of the scale factor $R_{d\phi} = (m_\eta^{7/15} \phi_o^{2/5} M_P^{2/15}/\tilde{m}) R_\eta$.

Finally, the baryon asymmetry in the Affleck-Dine scenario with inflation becomes [15]

$$\frac{n_B}{s} \sim \frac{\epsilon {\phi_o}^4 {m_\eta}^{3/2}}{{M_X}^2 {M_P}^{5/2} \tilde{m}} \sim \frac{\epsilon m_\eta^{7/2}}{{M_X}^2 {M_P}^{1/2} \tilde{m}} \sim (10^{-6} - 1)\epsilon \tag{104}$$

for $\tilde{m} \sim (10^{-17} - 10^{-16}) M_P$, and $M_X \sim (10^{-4} - 10^{-3}) M_P$ and $m_\eta \sim (10^{-8} - 10^{-7}) M_P$.

3 Lepto-Baryogenesis

The realization[33] of significant baryon number violation at high temperature within the standard model, has opened the door for many new possibilities for the generation of a net baryon asymmetry. Indeed, it may be possible to generate the asymmetry entirely with the context of the standard model [34]. Electroweak baryon number violation occurs through non-perturbative interactions mediated by "sphalerons", which violate $B + L$ and conserve $B - L$. For this reason, any gut produced asymmetry with $B - L = 0$ may be subsequently erased by sphaleron interactions [35].

The origin of the sphaleron interactions lies in the anomalies of the electroweak current

$$J_B^\mu = N_f \left(\frac{g_2^2}{32\pi^2} W\tilde{W} - \frac{g_1^2}{32\pi^2} B\tilde{B} \right) \tag{105}$$

This gives rise to a non-trivial vacuum structure with degenerate vacuum states with differing baryon number. At $T = 0$, the rates for such transitions is highly suppressed [36], $\propto e^{-2\pi/\alpha_W}$. However at high temperatures, the transition rate is related to the diffusion rate over a potential barrier, $\Gamma_S \sim \left(M_W^7/\alpha_W^3 T^6\right) e^{-4M_W/\alpha_W T}$ in the broken phase. In the symmetric phase, the barrier becomes very small and transitions are relatively unsuppressed, $\Gamma_S \sim (\alpha_W^4 T)$.

With $B - L = 0$, it is relatively straightforward to see that the equilibrium conditions including sphaleron interactions gives zero net baryon number [37]. By assigning each particle species a chemical potential, and using gauge and Higgs interactions as conditions on these potentials (with generation indices suppressed),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_- + \mu_0 = \mu_W \qquad \mu_{u_R} - \mu_{u_L} = \mu_0 \qquad \mu_{d_R} - \mu_{d_L} = -\mu_0 \\
&\mu_{l_R} - \mu_{l_L} = -\mu_0 \qquad \mu_{d_L} - \mu_{u_L} = \mu_W \qquad \mu_{l_L} - \mu_\nu = \mu_W
\end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

one can write down a simple set of equations for the baryon and lepton numbers and electric charge which reduce to:

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= 12\mu_{u_L} \\
L &= 3\mu - 3\mu_0 \\
Q &= 6\mu_{u_L} - 2\mu + 14\mu_0
\end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

where $\mu = \sum \mu_{\nu_i}$. In (107), the constraint on the weak isospin charge, $Q_3 \propto \mu_W = 0$ has been employed. Though the charges B, L, and Q have been written as chemical potentials, since for small asymmetries, an asymmetry $(n_f - n_{\bar{f}})/s \propto \mu_f/T$, we can regard these quantities as net number densities.

The sphaleron process yields the additional condition,

$$9\mu_{u_L} + \mu = 0 \tag{108}$$

which allows one to solve for L and $B - L$ in terms of μ_{u_L}, ultimately giving

$$B = \frac{28}{79}(B - L) \tag{109}$$

Thus, in the absence of a primordial $B - L$ asymmetry, the baryon number is erased by equilibrium processes. Note that barring new interactions (in an extended model) the quantities $\frac{1}{3}B - L_e$, $\frac{1}{3}B - L_\mu$, and $\frac{1}{3}B - L_\tau$ remain conserved.

With the possible erasure of the baryon asymmetry when $B - L = 0$ in mind, since minimal SU(5) preserves $B - L$, electroweak effects require guts beyond SU(5) for the asymmetry generated by the out-of-equilibrium decay scenario to survive. Guts such as SO(10) where a primordial $B - L$ asymmetry can be generated becomes a promising choice. The same holds true in the Affleck-Dine mechanism for generating a baryon asymmetry. In larger guts there are baryon number violating operators and associated flat directions[38]. A specific example in SO(10) was worked out in detail by Morgan[39].

An important question remaining to be answered is whether or not the baryon asymmetry can in fact be generated during the electroweak weak phase transition. This has been the focus of much attention in recent years. I refer the reader to the review of ref. [34]. In the remainder of these lectures, I will focus on alternative means for generating a baryon asymmetry which none-the-less makes use of the sphaleron interactions.

The above argument regarding the erasure of a primordial baryon asymmetry relied on the assumption that all particle species are in equilibrium. However, because of the extreme smallness of the electron Yukawa coupling, e_R does not come into equilibrium until the late times. The e_R decoupling temperature is determined by the rate of $e_R \to e_L + H$ transitions and comparing this rate to the expansion rate

$$\Gamma_{LR} = \frac{\pi h_e^2}{192\zeta(3)} \frac{m_H^2}{T} \sim \frac{20T^2}{M_P} \simeq H \tag{110}$$

which gives $T = T_* \sim$ O(few) TeV. Thus one may ask the question, whether or not the baryon asymmetry may be stored in a primordial e_R asymmetry [40]. Because sphalerons preserve $B - L$, any lepton number stuck in e_R is accompanied by an equal baryon number. However, at temperatures below the e_R decoupling temperature, baryon number will begin to be destroyed so long as sphalerons are in equilibrium. Sphalerons are in equilibrium from about the electroweak phase transition to $T \sim 10^{12}$ GeV [33]. As it turns out, the e_R (baryon) asymmetry is exponentially sensitive to parameters of the model.

To clearly see the role of e_R decoupling, it is helpful to look again at the equations relating chemical potentials. Above the scale T_*, the relation $\mu_{e_R} = \mu_{e_L} - \mu_0$ does not hold. Instead there is an equilibrium solution [41]

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0 &= \frac{5}{153}(\mu_{e_R} - \mu_{e_L}) \\ B = 12\mu_{u_L} &= \frac{44}{153}(\mu_{e_R} - \mu_{e_L}) \end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

One can quickly see now that below T_*, when $\mu_{e_R} = \mu_{e_L} - \mu_0$ is respected, the only solution yields $\mu_0 = B = L = 0$. In terms of conserved quantities, above, T_* we can write the equilibrium solution for B [41]

$$B_{eq} = \frac{66}{481}\left(3L_{e_R} + (\frac{1}{3}B - L_e)\right) \tag{112}$$

where L_{e_R} is the lepton asymmetry stored in e_R's and L_e is the total lepton asymmetry. Note that this is independent of the initial baryon asymmetry. Below T_*, the baryon asymmetry drops off exponentially

$$B = B_{eq} e^{-\int_{t_*}^{t_c} \frac{711}{481}\Gamma_{LR} dt} \tag{113}$$

integrated from T_* to the electroweak phase transition where sphaleron interactions quickly freeze out. With standard model parameters, the baryon asymmetry is not preserved [40, 41].

Another possibility for preserving a primordial baryon asymmetry when $B - L = 0$ comes if the asymmetry produced by scalar condensates in the Affleck-Dine mechanism is large ($n_B/s \gtrsim 10^{-2}$) [42]. After the decay of the A-D condensate, the baryon number is shared among fermion and boson superpartners. However, in equilibrium, there is a maximum chemical potential $\mu_f = \mu_B = \tilde{m}$ and for a large asymmetry, the baryon number density stored in fermions, $n_{B_f} = \frac{g_f}{6}\mu_f T^2$ is much less than the total baryon density. The bulk of the baryon asymmetry is driven into the $p = 0$ bosonic modes and a Bose-Einstein condensate is formed [43]. The critical temperature for the formation of this condensate is given by $n_B \simeq n_{B_b} + n_{B_c} = \frac{g_b}{3}\tilde{m}T_c^2$ so that,

$$n_{B_c} = \frac{g_b}{3}\left(1 - \left(\frac{T}{T_c}\right)^2\right)T_c^2 \tag{114}$$

At $T < T_c$, most of the baryon number remains in a condensate and for large n_B, the condensate persists down to temperatures of order 100 GeV. Thus sphaleron interactions are shut off and a primordial baryon asymmetry is maintained even with $B - L = 0$. One should note however that additional sources of entropy are required to bring η down to acceptable levels.

As alluded to above, sphaleron interactions also allow for new mechanisms to produce a baryon asymmetry. The simplest of such mechanisms is based on the decay of a right handed neutrino-like state[44]. This mechanism is certainly novel in that does not require grand unification at all. By simply adding to the Lagrangian a Dirac and Majorana mass term for a new right handed neutrino state,

$$\mathcal{L} \ni M\nu^c\nu^c + \lambda HL\nu^c \tag{115}$$

the out-of-equilibrium decays $\nu^c \to L+H^*$ and $\nu^c \to L^*+H$ will generate a non-zero lepton number $L \neq 0$. The out-out-equilibrium condition for these decays translates to $10^{-3}\lambda^2 M_P < M$ and M could be as low as $O(10)$ TeV. (Note that once again in order to have a non-vanishing contribution to the C and CP violation in this process at 1-loop, at least 2 flavors of ν^c are required. For the generation of masses of all three neutrino flavors, 3 flavors of ν^c are required.) Sphaleron effects can transfer this lepton asymmetry into a baryon asymmetry since now $B-L \neq 0$. A supersymmetric version of this scenario has also been described [14, 45].

The survival of the asymmetry, of course depends on whether or not electroweak sphalerons can wash away the asymmetry. The persistence of lepton number violating interactions in conjunction with electroweak sphaleron effects could wipe out [46] both the baryon and lepton asymmetry in the mechanism described above through effective operators of the form $\lambda^2 LLHH/M$. In terms of chemical potentials, this interaction adds the condition $\mu_\nu + \mu_0 = 0$. The constraint comes about by requiring that this interaction be out of equilibrium at the time when sphalerons are in equilibrium. The additional condition on the chemical potentials would force the solution $B = L = 0$.

It is straightforward to derive a constraint [46]-[49],[37] on M/λ^2. So long as the $\Delta L = 2$ operator is out-of-equilibrium while sphalerons are in equilibrium the baryon asymmetry is safe. The out-of-equilibrium condition is

$$\Gamma_{\Delta L} = \frac{\zeta(3)}{8\pi^3}\frac{\lambda^4 T^3}{M^2} < \frac{20T^2}{M_P} \simeq H \tag{116}$$

yielding

$$\frac{M}{\lambda^2} \gtrsim 0.015\sqrt{T_{BL}M_P} \tag{117}$$

where T_{BL} is the temperature at which the $B-L$ asymmetry was produced or the maximum temperature when sphalerons are in equilibrium (or the temperature T_* of e_R decoupling which we will momentarily ignore) whichever is lower. Originally [46], $T_{BL} \sim T_c \sim 100$ GeV was chosen giving, $M/\lambda^2 \gtrsim 5 \times 10^8$ GeV and corresponds to a limit on neutrino masses $m_\nu \sim \lambda^2 v^2/M \lesssim 50$ keV. In [37], it was pointed out that sphalerons should be in equilibrium up to 10^{12} GeV, in which case, $M/\lambda^2 \gtrsim 10^{14}$ GeV and corresponds to $m_\nu \lesssim 1$ eV. Similarly, it is possible to put constraints on other B and/or L violating operators [47, 48] which include R-parity violating operators in supersymmetric models. For example [47], the mass scale associated with a typical dimension 3 operator is constrained to be $m \lesssim 2 \times 10^{-5}$ GeV, the quartic coupling of a dimension 4 operator, $\lambda \lesssim 7 \times 10^{-7}$ or the mass scale of a higher dimensional operator such as a dimension 9, $\Delta B = 2$, operator is $M \gtrsim 10^3 - 10^{13}$ GeV. Only the latter is dependent on the choice of T_{BL}.

In supersymmetric models however, it has been argued by [49] that due to additional anomalies which can temporarily protect the asymmetry (until the effects of supersymmetry breaking kick in), the maximum temperature should be at $\sim 10^8 GeV$ rather than $\sim 10^{12} GeV$. Interestingly, in the context of inflation, though the reheat temperature is typically 10^8 GeV, equilibration is not achieved until about 10^5 GeV [15] thus the maximum temperature should not surpass this

Figure 14: Lepton-violating and left-right equilibrating rates.

equilibration temperature [14]. These changes in T_{max} would soften the limits on the mass scales of dimension $D \geq 5$ operators. For example, for the D=5 ($\Delta L = 2$) operator above, $M/\lambda^2 \gtrsim 10^9 - 10^{10} GeV$.

There are other subtleties regarding these limits. The presence of separate lepton asymmetries combined with mass effects can protect an asymmetry as an equilibrium solution[50, 51, 52]. The rates for some operators may be small enough to leave approximately conserved quantities such as $\frac{1}{3}B - L_i$[53]. Or, it may be possible that the asymmetry can be stored in a weakly interacting field such as the right-handed electron[40].

Indeed, it has been shown[41] that because e_R only comes into equilibrium at the relatively cool temperature $T_* \sim$few TeV, above T_* the baryon number is safe and the picture of baryon number erasure is changed. Sphaleron erasure of the baryon asymmetry can only occur between the T_* and the decoupling temperature T_f of the additional B and/or L violating rates as seen in Figure 14. If $T_f > T_*$, the baryon asymmetry is protected and may even be generated as shown below. Thus for limits on B and L violating operators, T_{max} should be set at T_* further relaxing the constraints on new operators.

How then can we generate a baryon asymmetry from a prior lepton asymmetry? In addition to the mechanism described earlier utilizing a right-handed neutrino decay, several others are now also available. In a supersymmetric extension of the standard model including a right-handed neutrino, there are numerous possibilities. Along the lines of the right-handed neutrino decay, the scalar partner [14] or a condensate [45] of $\tilde{\nu}^c$'s will easily generate a lepton asymmetry. Furthermore if the superpotential contains terms such as $\nu^{c3} + \nu^c H_1 H_2$, there will be a flat direction violating lepton number [54, 14] à la Affleck and Dine. While none of these scenarios require guts, those that involve the out-of equilibrium decay of either fermions, scalars or condensates must have the mass scale of the right-handed neutrino between 10^9 and about 10^{11} GeV, to avoid washing out the baryon asymmetry later (as can be seen from eq. (117)) and to be produced after inflation respectively. In contrast the decay of the flat direction condensate (which involves other fields in addition to $\tilde{\nu}^c$) only works for $10^{11} < M < 10^{15}$ GeV.

Flavor effects may also generate a baryon asymmetry. Indeed consider the $\Delta L = 2$ operator discussed above. If all flavors are out of equilibrium, then the process for all intents and purposes can be neglected. The only baryon asymmetry that will result will be the small one due to mass effects [50, 51], unless a larger ($\gtrsim 10^{-4}$ asymmetry is produced say by the Affleck and Dine mechanism [52]. If all of the flavors are in equilibrium, then the bound (117) is not satisfied and B is driven to zero. On the other hand, if the bound is satisfied by 1 or 2 generations, then even if initially $B = L = 0$, a baryon asymmetry will be generated and will be given by

$$B = \frac{84}{247}\mu_{\frac{2}{3}B-(L_1+L_2)} \tag{118}$$

assuming that only generations 1 and 2 are out of equilibrium and satisfy the bound[40].

Once again, to see this more clearly it is helpful to write quantities in terms of chemical potentials. Below T_*, all of the quantities of interest can be expressed in terms of 5 chemical potentials: μ_{u_L}, μ_0, and μ_{ν_i}. There are two constraints: $Q = 0$ and the sphaleron constraint (108) and the three initial conditions, $\frac{1}{3}B - L_i$. If all three of these conservation laws are broken eg. by the $\Delta L = 2$ processes discussed above and $\mu_0 = -\mu_{\nu_i}$, then we are left with two parameters, μ_{u_L} and μ_0, with two constraints: $Q = 6\mu_{u_L} - 20\mu_0 = 0$ and $9\mu_{u_L} - 3\mu_0 = 0$ yielding only the trivial solution $B = L = \mu_{u_L} = \mu_0 = 0$. Clearly a non-trivial solution will be obtained when one or two of the $\frac{1}{3}B - L_i$'s are conserved between T_c and T_*.

Finally, a pre-existing e_R asymmetry will also be transformed into a baryon asymmetry [41]. With e_R decoupled, the quantities (107) become

$$\begin{aligned} B &= 12\mu_{u_L} \\ L &= 3\mu + \mu_{e_R} - 2\mu_H - \mu_{e_L} \\ Q &= 6\mu_{u_L} - 2\mu - \mu_{e_R} + 13\mu_H + \mu_{e_L} \end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

which when combined with the sphaleron condition (108), and the the $\Delta L = 2$ condition $\mu_\nu + \mu_H = 0$, one finds that above T_*

$$B_* = \frac{1}{5}\mu_{e_R} \qquad L_* = \frac{1}{2}\mu_{e_R} \tag{120}$$

independent of the initial value of B and L. Assuming that the $\Delta L = 2$ interactions are out of equilibrium below T_*, we now have from eq. (109) that

$$B = \frac{28}{79}\left(B_* - L_*\right) \simeq -0.1\mu_{e_R} \tag{121}$$

Similarly, if any other other baryon and/or lepton number violating operator was in equilibrium at some point above T_* and so long as it decouples above T_*, a baryon asymmetry (or more precisely a $B - L$ asymmetry) will be produced.

In summary, I hope that it is clear that the generation of a baryon asymmetry is in principle relatively easy and that sphaleron interactions may in fact aid rather than hinder the production of an asymmetry. There are many possibilities and perhaps more than one of them are actually responsible for the final observed asymmetry.

References

[1] J.C. Mather et al., *Ap.J.* **420** (1994) 439.

[2] see eg. J.L.Tonry, in *Relativistic Astrophysics and Particle Cosmology* ed. C.W. Akerlof and M. Srednicki (New York Academy of Sciences, New York, 1993), p.113.

[3] T.P. Walker, G. Steigman, D.N. Schramm, K.A. Olive, and H.-S. Kang, *Ap.J.* **376** (1991) 51.

[4] W. Rindler, *M.N.R.A.S.* **116** (1956) 663; G.F.R. Ellis and W. Stoeger, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **5** (1988) 207.

[5] G.F. Smoot et al. *Ap.J* **396** (1992) L1; E.L. Wright et al. *Ap.J.* **396** (1992) L13.

[6] P.J.E. Peebles, *The Large Scale Structure of the Universe*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1980).

[7] S.K. Blau and A.H. Guth, in *300 Years of Gravitation*, ed. S.W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,1987).

[8] G. t'Hooft, *Nucl. Phys.* **B79** (1974) 276; A.M. Polyakov, *JETP Lett.* **20** (1974) 194.

[9] T.W.B. Kibble, *J. Phys.* **A9** (1976) 1387.

[10] Ya. B. Zeldovich and M.Y. Khlopov, *Phys. Lett.* **79B** (1979) 239; J.P. Preskill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43** (1979) 1365.

[11] for reviews see: A.D. Linde, Particle Physics And Inflationary Cosmology Harwood (1990); K.A. Olive, *Phys.Rep.* **C190**(1990) 307.

[12] W.H. Press, *Phys. Scr.* **21** (1980) 702; V.F. Mukhanov and G.V. Chibisov, *JETP Lett.* **33** (1981) 532; S.W. Hawking, *Phys. Lett.* **115B** (1982) 295; A.A. Starobinsky, , *Phys. Lett.* **117B** (1982) 175; A.H. Guth and S.Y. Pi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49** (1982) 1110; J.M. Bardeen, P.J. Steinhardt and M.S. Turner, *Phys. Rev.* **D28** (1983) 679.

[13] P.J.E. Peebles, *Ap.J. Lett.* **263**(1982) L1; L.F. Abbott and M.B. Wise, *Phys. Lett.* **B135**(1984) 279.

[14] B. Campbell, S. Davidson, and K.A. Olive, *Nucl.Phys.* **B399** (1993) 111.

[15] J. Ellis, K. Enqvist, D.V. Nanopoulos, and K.A. Olive, *Phys. Lett.* **B191**(1987) 343.

[16] G. Steigman, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **14** (1976) 339.

[17] A.D. Sakharov, *JETP Lett.* **5** (1967) 24.

[18] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, (1979) 850; D. Toussaint, S. B. Treiman, F. Wilczek, and A. Zee, *Phys. Rev.* **D19** (1979) 1036.

[19] J.N. Fry, K.A. Olive, and M.S. Turner, *Phys. Rev.* **D22** (1980) 2953; **D22** (1980) 2977; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45** (1980) 2074.

[20] E.W. Kolb and S. Wolfram, *Phys. Lett.* **B91** (1980) 217; *Nucl. Phys.* **B172** (1980) 224.

[21] for reviews see: E.W. Kolb and M.S. Turner, *Ann. Rev. Nucl.Part. Sci.* **33** (1983) 645; A. Dolgov, *Phys. Rep.* in press (1993).

[22] G.G. Ross, *Grand Unified Theories* (Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, 1984).

[23] A. Buras, J. Ellis, M.K. Gaillard, and D.V. Nanopoulos, *Nucl. Phys.* **B135** (1978) 66.

[24] D.V. Nanopoulos and S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D20** (1979) 2484; S. Barr, G. Segré and H.A. Weldon, *Phys. Rev.* **D20** (1979) 2494; A. Yildiz and P.H. Cox, *Phys. Rev.* **D21** (1980) 906.

[25] M. Yoshimura, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **41** (1978) 281; A. Ignatiev, N. Krasnikov, V. Kuzmin, and A. Tavkhelidze, *Phys. Lett.* **B76** (1978) 436; S. Dimopoulos, and L. Susskind, *Phys. Rev.* **D18** (1978) 4500; J. Ellis, M.K. Gaillard, and D.V. Nanopoulos, *Phys. Lett.* **B80** (1979) 360.

[26] A.D. Dolgov, and A.D. Linde, *Phys. Lett.* **B116** (1982) 329; D.V. Nanopoulos, K.A. Olive, and M. Srednicki, *Phys. Lett.* **B127** (1983) 30.

[27] J. Wess and B. Zumino, *Phys. Lett.* **B49** (1974) 52; J. Iliopoulos and B. Zumino, *Nucl. Phys.* **B76** (1974) 310; S. Ferrara, J. Iliopoulos and B. Zumino, *Nucl. Phys.* **B77** (1974) 413; M.T. Grisaru, W. Siegel and M. Rocek, *Nucl. Phys.* **B159** (1979) 420.

[28] J. Ellis, S. Kelly, and D.V. Nanopoulos, *Phys. Lett.* **B249** (1990) 442; and *Phys. Lett.* **B260** (1991) 131; U. Amaldi, W. de Boer, and H. Furstenau, *Phys. Lett.* **B260** (1991) 447; P. Langacker and M. Luo, *Phys. Rev.* **D44** (1991) 817; G. Gambieri, G. Ridolfi, and F. Zwirner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B331** (1990) 331.

[29] J. Ellis, D.V. Nanopoulos, and S. Rudaz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B202** (1982) 43.

[30] D.V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, *Phys. Lett.* **B114** (1982) 235.

[31] I. Affleck and M. Dine, *Nucl. Phys.* **B249** (1985) 361.

[32] A.D. Linde, *Phys. Lett.* **B160** (1985) 243.

[33] V. Kuzmin, V. Rubakov and M. Shaposhnikov, *Phys. Lett.* **B155** (1985) 36.

[34] for a review see: A.G. Cohen, D.B. Kaplan, and A.E. Nelson, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **43** (1993) 27.

[35] P. Arnold and L. McLerran, *Phys. Rev.* **D36** (1987) 581; **D37** (1988) 1020.

[36] G. 't Hooft,*Phys.Rev.Lett.* **37** (1976) 8; *Phys.Rev.* **D14** (1976) 3432.

[37] J.A. Harvey and M.S. Turner, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 3344.

[38] B. Campbell, J. Ellis, D.V. Nanopoulos, and K. A. Olive, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A1** (1986) 389.

[39] D. Morgan, *Nucl. Phys.* **B364** (1991) 401.

[40] B. Campbell, S. Davidson, J. Ellis, and K. A. Olive, *Phys.Lett.* **B297** (1992) 118.

[41] J. Cline, K. Kainulainen, and K.A. Olive, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71** (1993) 2372 ; and *Phys. Rev.* **D49** (1994) in press.

[42] S. Davidson, H. Murayama, and K.A. Olive, *Phys. Lett.* **B** (1994) in press.

[43] A.D. Dolgov and D.P. Kirilova, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **50** (1989) 1006.

[44] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Lett.* **B174** (1986) 45.

[45] H. Murayama, H. Suzuki, T. Yanagida, and J. Yokoyama, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** (1993) 1912.

[46] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 1285.

[47] B. Campbell, S. Davidson, J. Ellis, and K. A. Olive, *Phys. Lett.* **B256** (1991) 457; Astropart. Phys. 1 (1992) 77.

[48] W. Fischler, G.F. Giudice, R.G. Leigh and S. Paban, *Phys. Lett.* **B258** (1991) 45.

[49] L.E. Ibanez and F. Quevedo, *Phys. Lett.* **B283** (1992) 261.

[50] V.A. Kuzmin, V.A. Rubakov and M.E. Shaposhnikov, *Phys. Lett.* **B191** (1987) 171.

[51] H. Dreiner and G.G. Ross, *Nucl. Phys.* **B407** (1993) 188.

[52] S. Davidson, K. Kainulainen, and K.A. Olive, University of Minnesota preprint UMN-TH-1248/94.

[53] A.E. Nelson and S.M. Barr, *Phys. Lett.* **B246** (1990) 141.

[54] B. Campbell, S. Davidson, and K.A. Olive, *Phys. Lett.* **B303** (1993) 63.